Tackling Antisemitism within English Football: A Critical Analysis of Policies and Campaigns using a Multiple Streams Approach

Emma Poulton
Durham University, England

Abstract

While the anti-racist movement in English football has been established for 25 years, antisemitism was not specifically addressed until much later – most publicly through anti-discrimination organisation Kick It Out's *The Y-Word* (2011) film campaigning against the use of 'Yid' in football fan culture. Antisemitism has occupied a sporadic position on football's wider anti-racism agenda. Antisemitism in football is also a neglected area of research. The article addresses this academic indifference by contributing a critical analysis of the intermittent responses to antisemitism in English men's football – by governing bodies, campaigners, and criminal justice system – using a multiple streams approach to understand policy formulation, legitimation and implementation, arguing these attempts have usually been reactive and sometimes misguided, inconsistent, or misaligned with existing legislation. The role of 'policy entrepreneurs' is considered in relation to individuals lobbying for and influencing the priority of tackling formations of antisemitism amidst broader attempts to combat racism and faith-based abuse in football. This empirically-grounded critical analysis is informed by primary data from interviews with elite stakeholders from English football (The Football Association; Kick It Out) and Jewish community (Board of Deputies of British Jews; Jewish Leadership Council; Community Security Trust; Maccabi GB). The article explains the changing political salience of combating antisemitism and concludes with a call for a more congruous and coherent approach to addressing antisemitism, faith-based abuse and other forms of discrimination in football, which

might lend itself to other sports and contexts. It also critiques the utility of the multiple streams approach.

Introduction

This article uses interviews with elite stakeholders to explain the changing political salience of attempts to address antisemitism within English football, and the policy processes involved, through the lens of a multiple streams approach (Kingdon 1984). There have been high profile incidents of an antisemitic nature within English men's football over the last decade involving supporters, professional players, coaches and officials. The increase in reports of antisemitism to Kick It Out (2019) – English football's equality and inclusion campaigning organisation – mirror the incremental rise in reported incidents of antisemitism more broadly within the UK (Community Security Trust 2018, 2019); a trend that is reflected globally against a backdrop of far-right political parties and populist movements thriving across Europe. This has found expression in acts of terror against Jewish communities by extremists in France, Denmark and the USA.

Space precludes a comprehensive review the origins and different ways of theorising the phenomenon of antisemitism, nor its socio-historical manifestations (see Hirsh 2018; Kushner 2013; Meer 2013). Whilst acknowledging that antisemitism is a complex and contested phenomenon – with scholarly, political, legal and religious debates as to whether it should be recognised and treated as a distinct form of racism (Meer 2013; Meer and Noorani 2008) – the article adheres to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's (2016) 'Working Definition'[1] of antisemitism as:

> A certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

The definition is accompanied by a list of examples, which illustrate how contemporary permutations are based on one, or a combination, of religion (anti-Judaism), ethnicity (racism), or geo-politics (anti-Zionism). The latter is exacerbated by the situation in Palestine and Gaza and hostilities toward the State of Israel (see Dart 2017), which can trigger spikes in antisemitic incidents (CST, 2018). Antisemitic rhetoric can include: tropes or allegations of Jewish conspiracy, wealth, power, manipulation, immorality, hostility to others; and Holocaust denial, justification, distortion, or trivialisation.

It is unlikely that most antisemitism within the context of contemporary English football is motivated by genuine anti-Jewish, neo-Nazi sentiments, nor even anti-Zionist sentiments.[2] This is in contrast to, for example, Hungary (Győri Szabó 2019), Poland (Woźniak 2018), Italy (Doidge 2015) and the Balkans (Brentin 2015), where the problem of antisemitism is much worse in football and wider society, as a reflection of these nations' far-left or far-right political and martial histories and contemporary politics, which influence the allegiances and motivations of leftist and right-wing 'Ultra' groups that are found in their fan cultures. Notwithstanding this observation, antisemitic rhetoric is still very much evident in English football – especially among supporters – where it is used to signify collective identity and express club rivalry and hostility, especially toward Tottenham Hotspur due to the club's perceived 'Jewish' association, as will be discussed later.

While the anti-racist movement in English football developed over twenty-five years ago and is now firmly established and supported by a raft of equalities law and football-specific legislation that has criminalised racism in football (Garland and Rowe 2001 2014), antisemitism was not specifically addressed until much later. This was done most conspicuously by Kick It Out's euphemistically-titled *The Y-Word* (2011) campaign film, which challenged the controversial use of the Jewish ethnonym 'Yid'

within the vernacular culture of football fans (Poulton and Durell 2016; Poulton 2016). Antisemitism *per se* has occupied a sporadic position on the wider anti-racism agenda in English football since its late arrival. Similarly, while racism, racialisation and anti-racism within English football has been widely studied (for example, Back, Crabbe and Solomos 2001; Burdsey 2011, 2014; Cleland and Cashmore 2014, 2016; Garland and Rowe 2001, 2014; Lawrence and Davis 2019) and also elsewhere in Europe (Kasssimeris 2009), faith-based abuse and especially antisemitism within football is a neglected area of academic research. Academic focus instead tends to be on the experiences of black and, to a lesser extent, Asian players, coaches, and supporters and attempts to address the processes of racialisation and forms of racism towards them. Outside sport studies, there is negligible acknowledgement of the presence of antisemitism within football, never mind the nature or scale of the problem at both the professional and grass roots levels of the game. This is peculiar given that football is a ubiquitous part of popular culture in all developed countries and antisemitism is a global and very current socio-political problem.

There have also been few attempts to theoretically explain and analyse policymaking processes for anti-racism initiatives – within the context of sport and more broadly – applying meso-level frameworks of policy formulation and implementation. Nor has bespoke policymaking to address antisemitism received much focus. This empirically-informed critical analysis addresses these academic neglects by chronologically charting and critiquing the intermittent responses to antisemitism in English football by governing bodies, campaigners, and the criminal justice system using a multi-streams approach (MSA) (Kingdon 1984). These attempts to tackle antisemitism have usually been reactive and sometimes misguided, inconsistent, or misaligned with existing legislation. This is mainly due to the ill-defined nature of what

the problem(s) is/are within the context of English football and therefore how different expressive forms of antisemitism can be effectively addressed, as antisemitism competes for the attention on the wider anti-discrimination agenda.

The integral role of 'policy entrepreneurs' – individuals with power, tenacity, or luck, to heighten levels of attention to policy problems to promote their 'pet solutions' (Kingdon 1984) – is highlighted in relation to such personnel influencing the position of tackling antisemitism amidst wider attempts to combat racism, faith-based abuse and other forms of discrimination in football. The following section provides an abridged history of anti-racism in English football, giving particular focus to the role of The Football Association (The FA) and Kick It Out. It also briefly explains the peculiarities in defining and consequently addressing antisemitism.

Anti-Racism Activism in English Football

Both UEFA, as the governing body of football in Europe, and the sport's highest international authority, FIFA, have been criticised for being 'white institutions' and for their lack of serious action to combat racism – especially through their derisory sanctions distributed to clubs and national governing bodies found in breach of anti-racist regulations (see Cleland and Cashmore 2014). As English football's national governing body (NGB), The FA, regulates all aspects of the amateur and professional game within its territory, including issues pertaining to equality, diversity and inclusion. The NGB is the focal organisation with the authority for policymaking in this respect, not the Government, nor anti-discrimination groups like Kick It Out or Show Racism the Red Card. Notwithstanding this, The FA arrived comparatively late to the table in terms of addressing racism in football. The anti-racist movement in English football first developed over twenty-five years ago involving independent campaigning

organisations with a national remit and local supporter-based initiatives, rather than the NGB (Back et al. 2001). Kick It Out (originally, Let's Kick Racism Out of Football), was founded in 1993 by Lord Herman Ouseley, then Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) – together with the players' trade union, Professional Footballers' Association (PFA) – in response to growing concerns about racial abuse directed at their black members by supporters and racist attitudes more broadly within the sport, on and off the pitch.

Back et al. (2001: 193) observe how, 'From its inception The FA gave its tacit approval to the CRE-PFA… this support initially had little substance and it seemed driven by a rather defensive public relations imperative rather than any understanding of or commitment to the issues at stake'. David Davies' appointment to a new post of Director of Public Relations ahead of the 1994-95 season marked something of a sea-change as The FA 'moved quickly to occupy a more central position in the campaign against racism in football' (ibid.). However, Back at al. (2001: 194) argue The FA's concern was 'driven by a more fundamental desire to prevent forms of fan behaviour that were seen as highly media sensitive and damaging to the game's public image', rather than taking a broader interest in the forms of racism that prevailed in English football's changing rooms, committee rooms and boardrooms. This is symptomatic of the conflation of 'hooliganism' and racism that dominated debates around social policy and anti-racism at this time (Back et al. 2001).

In 1997, Let's Kick Racism Out of Football was formally constituted as a charity and undertook a name-change to Kick It Out. The organisation works throughout the football, educational and community sectors to challenge discrimination, encourage inclusive practices, and campaign for positive change. It has no jurisdiction over supporters, players (professional or amateur), officials or administrators, despite public

assumptions. This misconception has led to criticism from some supporters (Cleland and Cashmore 2014), as well as accusations of 'tokenism' by high profile black footballers such as Rio Ferdinand. Similarly, Raheem Sterling has commented, 'A few times they get us to wear a t-shirt, but it is not enough. There needs to be harder punishments'; in this connection, he called upon The FA and English Premier League to consider, 'Teams getting points deductions, getting kicked out... this is when people start taking it seriously' (Dean 2019).

Kick It Out is (under-)funded by The FA, English Premier League, English Football League, and PFA, who each have a trustee on the board. For the 2018/19 season, Kick It Out received a total of £645,000 from their funders: £270,000 from the Premier League, and £125,000 each from the English Football League, The FA, and PFA (Wilson 2019). Despite this resource dependency, Kick It Out maintains its status as independent of – and so occasionally critical of – the NGB and the other organisations within English football's power structure. In this sense, Kick It Out are best understood as a 'gatekeeper' for equality, diversity and inclusion in English football.

Kick It Out's commitment to widening their focus to all forms of discrimination was further emphasised in July 2014 when they changed their constitution following Roisin Wood's arrival as CEO to encapsulate their work on disability, homophobia, biphobia and transphobia (see Magrath and Stott 2018) and also faith-related abuse. A related dimension of racialisation and racism in football is faith or religious prejudice or intolerance because 'Jews and Muslims define themselves – and are defined by others – through reference to race and religion' (Meer and Noorani 2008: 196). Both biological and cultural discourses are invoked in the racialisation of religious minorities. Kick It Out (2018) report that 'a number of issues surrounding antisemitism

and anti-Muslim hate continue to hamper the game at all levels both domestically and internationally'. There are around 50+ Muslim footballers currently playing in the English Premier League, with global stars like Liverpool's Mo Salah regularly targeted with Islamophobic abuse.

Very little focused academic attention has been given specifically to faith-based abuse to date. Exceptions are Millward's (2008) and Kilvington and Price's (2012) work on Islamophobia and my own previous research on antisemitism (Poulton 2016; Poulton and Durell 2016). To date, there has been no systematic academic focus upon attempts to *tackle* antisemitism within football. The next section explains the changing nature and prevalence of antisemitism within English football, illustrating how the phenomenon and processes of racialisation are manifest in various forms across the four inter-related fields within the broader structure of football culture: the cultural industries, institutional level, occupational level, and the vernacular culture of fans (Back et al. 2001).

Antisemitism in English Football

Although the implementation and gradual impact of anti-racist initiatives and also legislation targeting football supporters has 'created an environment in which the routine expression of racism in the form of chanting and abusing players and other supporters has become unacceptable' (Garland and Rowe 2014: 94), antisemitism – like other forms of discrimination – is still evident within English football fan culture and other spheres of the game. There has been an annually rising number of *reported* incidents of discrimination to Kick It Out and the overwhelming majority of reported faith-related incidents are of an antisemitic nature. In the 2011/12 season, eight of the overall 78 reports pertained to antisemitism, while 50 of the total 422 reported incidents

during 2018/19 were classified antisemitic (Kick It Out 2019). These increases could be indicative of the concurrent culture of 'naming and shaming', whereby people will more readily 'call out' others' misdemeanours. In English fan culture, supporters also sometimes self-police and challenge behaviour that is seen as lacking 'class', especially on social media. Another consideration – especially given the cumulative reports – is the introduction of Kick It Out's smart phone app in 2013 to facilitate discreet reporting of discriminatory abuse and supporters potentially having more confidence that their complaint will be dealt with.

Rhetorical and even physical manifestations of antisemitism within English football fan culture were much more prevalent during the 1970s and 1980s, when extreme right groups like the National Front and Combat 18 infiltrated and attempted to recruit from football's then more working-class fan-base and football-related disorder was also at its most acute (Back et al. 2001). During these decades, Nazi salutes were not an uncommon sight in English football crowds, just as black players regularly endured 'monkey' chants and gestures and having bananas thrown at them. In the early 1980s, rival supporters revised the lyrics of a favourite Tottenham Hotspur (nicknamed 'Spurs') song – 'Spurs are on their way to Wembley' (the national stadium, which hosts cup finals) – to: 'Spurs are on their way to Auschwitz. Hitler's gonna gas them again' because of the club's perceived 'Jewish' identity (Poulton 2016). This identity originates from Tottenham historically attracting Jewish supporters due to the north London club's geographical proximity to near-by Jewish communities who settled there in the early twentieth century after fleeing persecution in Russia and then Europe. In Tottenham Hotspur's (2014) survey of season-ticket holders, 9.97 per cent of respondents (*n.*11389) self-declared they were Jewish.

Although the majority of Tottenham's fan-base is not Jewish, the club's supporters are all 'othered' as such. Football supporters have a tendency to go for the perceived Achilles' heel of their rivals to wind them up and get under their skin. Consequently, Tottenham supporters have traditionally been, and remain, regular targets of antisemitic rhetoric from other clubs' fans. Opponents' songs, chants and social media posts employ Jewish stereotypes (especially about thriftiness) and in their most odious form reference Hitler and the Nazi extermination camps of the Holocaust. They also make hissing sounds to emulate the noise of Zyklon B dispersal in the Nazi gas chambers. One of my interviewees's, Kick It Out's CEO Roisin Wood, revealed that the number of reports of antisemitism that they receive, 'Spike after Tottenham play. It spikes every time Tottenham play a London club, especially if they're playing Chelsea or West Ham'.

By illustration, footage emerged on social media in January 2017 of a small group of Manchester City fans on a tram travelling to their match against Tottenham singing: 'You're getting gassed in the morning', with one shouting: 'Fuck off, you fucking Yids. Fucking gas isn't good enough for ya' – both overt references to the treatment of Jews in the death camps during World War 2. Antisemitic rhetoric towards Tottenham supporters in England seems rarely underpinned by anti-Zionist geo-politics. An exception came following Tottenham's defeat in the UEFA Champions League Final 2019, when maverick politician and broadcaster George Galloway tweeted his congratulations to Liverpool, adding 'No #Israël flags on the Cup! … I despise the flag of Apartheid Israël at White Hart Lane, Ibrox [Glasgow Rangers FC], East Belfast'.

Despite sustained forms of antisemitism *towards* Tottenham supporters, they themselves have been the apparent primary focus of campaigns and policy interventions

to combat antisemitism in English football, as will be discussed below. This is because Tottenham supporters – both Gentiles *and* Jews – have for some forty years appropriated and paradoxically used the taboo term 'Yid' and moniker 'Yid Army' as one of endearment in their own songs and chants to affront the routinised antisemitic abuse they endure (Poulton 2016). While many people in Britain today might conceive 'Yid' to be an ethnic epithet and 'race hate' word, it is a term that has taken on differing subcultural meanings within the context of English football fandom (ibid.). Given the longevity of the use of 'Yid' and derivatives like 'Yiddo', these have now become normalised and synonymous with being a Tottenham supporter for many of their number, rather than pertaining to Jewishness. Such terms are proudly used by Tottenham supporters as an affectionate self-referent and certainly not used by them as invective to express Jew-hate.[3] Yet there have been a series of attempts to challenge Tottenham supporters' use of these words on the grounds that they are tacitly antisemitic and that their usage fuels and sustains the antisemitic rhetoric of other supporters (Poulton 2016).

Notwithstanding the focus upon football supporters by anti-racist pieces of work – such as Kick It Out's *The Y-Word* (2011) film campaign and The Football Association (2013) – there have been high profile incidents of antisemitic rhetoric occurring within the institutional and occupational spheres of English professional men's football involving administrators, club owners, coaches and players over recent years. In November 2014, Wigan Athletic owner, Dave Whelan, was fined and temporarily banned from football-related activity by The FA for employing an age-old trope about perceived Jewish wealth and thrift as he claimed, 'Jews chase money more than everyone else' in a newspaper interview (Conn 2014). There were accusations of antisemitism at the very top of English football's institutional pyramid in March 2018

when The FA's Chief Executive, Martin Glenn, likened the Star of David to Nazi swastikas and images of Robert Mugabe as he attempted to defend the NGB's ban on the display of political symbols during matches (Winter 2018). Glenn was roundly criticised by Jewish community organisations and Kick It Out for his remarks about the religious symbol of immense importance to Jews. Winter (2018), Chief Football Writer for *The Times*, pointedly questioned: 'How can players and clubs take The FA seriously after Martin Glenn's crass comments?'

The most prominent incident within football's occupational culture occurred during an English Premier League match in December 2013. West Bromwich Albion player Nicolas Anelka celebrated scoring with a 'quenelle' gesture, recognised as a reversed Nazi salute (despite his protestations) because of its association with French comedian, Dieudonne M'bala M'bala – Anelka's friend – who has convictions for inciting racial hatred against Jews in France. All of my interviewees referred to the impact of the Anelka case on the Jewish community and the disciplinary sanctions imposed on him by The FA, as discussed below.

In contrast, in April 2019 an independent regulatory panel appointed by The FA found the disciplinary charge against Crystal Palace footballer, Wayne Hennessey – who appeared to make a Nazi salute in a restaurant – 'unproven'. Hennessey's defence was that he was attempting to attract the attention of the photographer (a German teammate). Incredulously, the panel found Hennessey displayed 'a very considerable – one might even say lamentable – degree of ignorance about anything to do with Hitler, fascism and the Nazi regime' and advised he 'familiarised himself with events'. Evidently there is dire need for more directed education and awareness-raising interventions across all spheres and levels of football to address expressions of antisemitism.

Explaining policy change through the multiple streams approach

The history of equality, diversity and inclusion in UK sport policy, process and practice has been explicated by the collective work of, among others, Collins and Kay (2014) and Hylton and Long (2016). Although there is abundant research into racism and anti-racism in football, this has primarily evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the anti-racism movement (Dixon, Lowes and Gibbons 2014; Garland and Rowe 2014, 2001; Lusted 2013). Most of this work fails to explicitly consider theories, models and concepts associated with frameworks of policy formulation and implementation evident in social and political sciences. The important work of Hylton (2010) theorises anti-racism in sport through Critical Race Theory, but does not theoretically explain the particularities of the policy process of anti-racism activists, organisations and agencies.

Kingdon (1984) adapted the 'garbage can model'[4] of choice to explain public policymaking and output by the US federal government. Since then, the simplicity and flexibility of MSA has led to many modern applications to a variety of contexts (Jones et al. 2016). MSA is presented here as a useful point of entry for analysing the policy process pertaining to attempts to tackle antisemitism in football because: first, it is one of the more fully articulated and internally coherent frameworks for policy analysis (Cairney 2018; Cairney and Jones 2016; Weible and Schlager 2016; Zahariadis 2007); second, it has been widely applied empirically (Jones et al. 2016); third, it has also been applied to policy analysis within the context of sport (Houlihan and Green 2006; Piggin and Hart 2017).

MSA uses the metaphor of 'streams' and 'windows of opportunity' to give greater emphasis to the role of agency, coincidence and opportunism – albeit within an identifiable pattern of organisational arrangements – to explain agenda-setting and processes of policy change and policymaking (Zahariadis 2007). The scope of this

framework provides an opportunity to explore the inter-relationships between ideas, individual policy actors, lobbyists/interest group activity, and the institutional arrangements that structure (if only loosely) the opportunities for influence. In doing so, MSA illuminates the importance of receptivity to policy solutions to policy problems within policy networks.

MSA contains five elements: *problems, policies, politics, policy windows,* and *policy entrepreneurs*. Kingdon (1984) regarded policy formation as the result of the interplay of three sets of processes, or through his metaphor of 'streams' that flow through the policy process: problems, policies, and politics. The convergence of all three streams dramatically enhances the chances that an issue will receive attention by policymakers and that a proposed policy will be adopted (Zahariadis 2007). The *problem stream* consists of various issues or conditions that policymakers (and citizens) want addressing, but which vie for ascendancy as attention lurches from one issue to another within a heady 'policy primeval soup' (Kingdon 1984). The *policy stream* is where potential solutions to particular problems are proposed and may garner favour, but windows of opportunity for this to happen are fleeting. This is dependent upon what is occurring in the *politics stream* and conditions such as public mood, lobbyists, and the ideological persuasion of those in power.

Each stream is ordinarily conceptualised as separate from the others with its own dynamics, characteristics and rules. However, at critical points in time (*policy windows*), the streams are joined together or 'coupled' by what Kingdon (1984) terms *policy entrepreneurs*: certain highly motivated people who propose solutions to problems, mobilising opinion and institutions, thereby ensuring their idea remains prominent. Windows of opportunity are 'opened by compelling problems or by events in the political stream' (Zahariadis 2007: 74) when policy entrepreneurs 'push their pet

solutions, or… push attention to their special problems' (Kingdon 1984: 165). Indicators used to assess the existence and magnitude of a problem, as well as scope for change, include the how much traction is gained with policy entrepreneurs and the media (Zahariadis 2014). Indeed, the 'Selection [of policies] is biased by the manipulating strategies and skills of policy entrepreneurs' and their involvement 'dramatically enhances the chances that a specific policy will be adopted by policy makers' (Zahariadis 2007: 65).

Policy entrepreneurs may be elected politicians, leaders of interest groups, or unofficial (even self-appointed) spokespeople for particular causes. They are people with the knowledge, power, tenacity and sometimes 'luck' to be able to exploit windows of opportunity and 'speak up for a policy problem in a way that sparks attention and concern of their audience' (Cairney 2018: 202). There are three strategies or 'habits' that effective policy entrepreneurs use to 'maximise their impact in crowded, complex and often unpredictable policy environments' according to Cairney (2016):

1. Telling a persuasive story to frame a policy problem to grab an audience's interest;
2. Ensuring their favoured solution is available before attention lurches to another problem;
3. Exploiting a 'window of opportunity' during which policymakers have the willingness and ability to adopt their policy solution.

To be 'skilled at coupling', two further variables are important for policy entrepreneurs: having both 'resources and access' (Zahariadis 2007: 78). In other words, financial and social capital are needed in order to facilitate the union of all three streams.

With regard to antisemitism, campaigners and policymakers within Jewish community third-sector organisations, football governing bodies, and campaigning groups like Kick It Out have had to compete for attention and search for solutions to the cause of antisemitism within the 'primeval soup' (to use Kingdon's metaphor) of

other forms of racism and discrimination in football. Figure 1 illustrates the network of multiple agencies (potentially) involved in tackling antisemitism within English football, although some have, to date, not engaged with the problem. Having outlined the central tenets of MSA, it evidently provides a conducive framework to analyse the belated then intermittent attention afforded to antisemitism on the wider anti-racism agenda in English football and the policy processes at work, as well as the various actors involved, most notably, the role of policy entrepreneurs.

Method

This empirically-informed study has developed from previous research I have undertaken on antisemitism in English football, which has primarily explained the uses and meanings of 'Yid' in fan culture, particularly by Tottenham supporters (Poulton and Durell 2016; Poulton 2016). My interest in this phenomenon stemmed from being a Tottenham supporter myself and consequently witnessing antisemitic abuse. Hearing hissing noises and songs like, 'I'd rather be a Paki than a Yid', engendered a sociological appetite to understand this form of discrimination more and a committed motivation to do something about it.

Both Kingdon (1984) and Houlihan and Green (2006) used interviews and document analysis methods; indeed 'most MSA applicants follow the same path' (Cairney and Jones 2016: 44), as does the research design for this study. Qualitative data were obtained from eight elite stakeholder interviews and a critical review of campaign initiatives in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of attempts to tackle antisemitism in English football since it was first officially addressed in 2008 up until 2017. In addition, policy and media statements pertaining to antisemitism issued by The FA (Mann 2010; The Football Association 2013), non-government agencies and

anti-discrimination groups (The Y-Word 2011; Kick It Out 2016) were analysed to gain an understanding of the nature of the initiative, and where possible, media and public reaction to the initiative.

Informed by MSA, elite interviews obtained key actors' understandings of anti-racism and anti-discrimination policy processes that would otherwise have been inaccessible (Lilleker 2003). Key stakeholders were initially identified from the network of agencies that have attempted to address antisemitism in English football (see Figure 1). The rationale for selecting the eight interviewees – detailed in Table 1 – was because of their current position of authority within their organisation and their involvement in the development and/or implementation of campaigns and policy to combat antisemitism in English football within the last decade, which they could therefore reflect upon and evaluate in terms of effectiveness. I had met three of the interviewees previously at conferences (Danny Lynch; Dave Rich; Roisin Wood), so corresponded with these first to request an interview. They then served as gatekeepers to the other interviewees. Ethical approval was granted by my institution and British Sociological Association guidelines were adhered to.

Table 1: Biographical Details of Interviewees

Interviewee's Name	Organisation	Position	Dates of Service
Jonathan ARKUSH	Board of Deputies of British Jews (BoD) – *the main representative body of British Jewry (est. 1760) to deal with political matters and to safeguard the interests of British Jews as a religious community.*	President	2015 – 2018
Funke AWODERU	The Football Association (FA) – the national governing body.	Senior Inclusion and Diversity Manager	2010 – present
Martin BERLINER	Maccabi GB (MGB) – *a leading British Jewish sports charity*	Chief Executive Officer	2000 – present
Simon JOHNSON	Jewish Leadership Council (JLC) – *a Jewish charity, which brings together the major British*	Chief Executive Officer	2013 – present

	Jewish organisations to work on behalf of the Jewish community. The Football Association (FA) English Premier League (EPL)	 COO of England's bid to host 2018 FIFA World Cup Director of Corporate Affairs Director of Legal and Business Affairs	 2008 – 2010 2005 – 2008 2003 – 2005
Danny LYNCH	The Football Association (FA) – the national governing body. Kick It Out (KIO)	PR Officer Inclusion and Anti-Discrimination. Media and Communications Manager	2013 – 2019 2008 – 2013
Dave RICH	Community Security Trust (CST) – *a charity (part funded by the Home Office) that works alongside the police to protect British Jews from antisemitism by providing physical security, advice and training for Jewish communal organisations, schools and synagogues.*	Head of Policy / Deputy Director of Communications	1994 – present
John MANN MP	All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism (APPG) – *All-Party Parliamentary Groups are formed by members of both Houses of Parliament from across the political spectrum and meet to discuss issues of concern. Unlike Select Committees, APPGs are voluntary and receive no parliamentary funding. They have no formal place in the legislature, but aim to develop effective public policy to combat antisemitism.*	Chair Chair of The FA's Taskforce on 'Tackling Antisemitism and Islamophobia'	2005 – 2019 (resigned as MP to take up role of advisor on antisemitism to the British Government) 2008-2010
Roisin WOOD	Kick It Out (KIO) – English football's leading equality and inclusion campaigning organisation.	Chief Executive Officer	2011 – present

Each interviewee was asked a similar set of questions inviting them to: reflect upon the position of antisemitism on the wider anti-racist agenda in football; explain their organisation's involvement in attempts to tackle antisemitism; evaluate the nature and effectiveness of these initiatives; assess the character, indicators and causes of change in the salience of combating antisemitism in English football; and reflect upon the most helpful direction for future campaigns or policy to tackle antisemitism in English football. All interviewees gave consent to being audio-recorded and having their name, organisation and official title used for research publication purposes. They were given the option of advance sight of drafts, with an opportunity to amend or clarify their contribution.

The interviews were undertaken between March 2017 and September 2017. These dates are significant because there were three terror attacks within the UK and the CST (2018) also recorded a spike in reports of antisemitism during this seven-month period. This data collection period also predates the January 2018 launch of Chelsea Football Club's 'Say No to Antisemitism' campaign to raise awareness of and educate their players, staff, fans and the wider community about antisemitism in football. As such, the interviewees were not asked about Chelsea's campaign and it was not considered to be feasible, nor professional, to return to high profile (and very busy) interviewees to subsequently ask them about a new emerging piece of work, which none mentioned and, by implication, were involved with/seemed aware of when I interviewed them. Furthermore, in terms of policy change, the longer-term significance of a single event cannot be effectively evaluated immediately after its inception.

The eight interview transcripts – and policy / media statements – were subjected to a contextualist method of thematic analysis, using a deductive approach that was theoretically-driven by the MSA. I acknowledge my personal position and role in the

research process and endeavoured to ensure that the thematic analysis of the interview data was undertaken with due care, attention and rigor to minimise the influence of my own identity markers as a gentile, white, English, female researcher. To this end, I re-read the data set numerous times for any repeated patterns of meaning pertaining to anti-racism and efforts to combat antisemitism while mindful of the structural elements and central conceptual tenets of MSA, which guide the following results section organised around the problem, policy and politics streams.

Problem Stream: Problematising the nature of the problem(s) of antisemitism in English football

As outlined, the MSA's problem stream involves policymakers identifying particular social conditions as 'problems' that need addressing. A problem must then align with the values and beliefs of policymakers in order to contribute to policy change. However, what became evident through my interviews was that there were different views on what the 'problem', or 'problems', actually is/are in terms of the nature of antisemitism within English football and therefore what needs addressing. The CST's Dave Rich explained this was because, 'Some antisemitic stuff just doesn't quite get recognised as racism'. Indeed, for a while, antisemitism was not recognised as a specific problem in English football. Rich underlined the persistent efforts of key individuals in drawing antisemitism to the attention of The FA and anti-racist campaigners and how this initially fell on deaf ears:

> I don't think it's an organic response to a problem because for years the anti-racist campaigns in football just didn't include antisemitism, it just wasn't part of the picture. It took years of nagging, firstly by Martin [Berliner] – he had the relationships with Kick It Out before we [CST] did – and of constantly making the point that it doesn't get included.

Berliner [MGB], who Rich inferred played a pivotal role as a 'policy entrepreneur', modestly attributed the early lobbying to another activist: 'The pioneering of this – Jonathan Metliss [current Chair of Action Against Discrimination[5]] was involved before I was – certainly took a decade, if not more, to get it on the agenda'. Berliner outlined his personal involvement as CEO of Maccabi GB in trying to get antisemitism within grassroots and youth football recognised as a problem:

> When I first arrived here in 2000, we couldn't get the topic on the agenda anywhere. We were telling them about anti-Jewish comments about gas chambers and 'Hitler was right' being made in under-12's football… Today, we're in a very different place and the work that we've done over that 17/18-year period has actually moved it significantly onto the agenda.

Berliner suggested Kick It Out were preoccupied during their infancy 'because of the history of colour being a big issue' and 'didn't register it on their website for many years' as it vied for attention alongside racism towards larger minority groups:

> We argued with Piara Powar [CEO, 1997-2010] as to why antisemitism was different to maybe what they were doing and that Jews didn't necessarily recognise the word 'race'. Even their logo back then with the big, black background: Kick It Out became synonymous around colour. So our arguments around ethnicity and religion… were not really seen under that label.

In this connection, Berliner pointed to the lack of professional Jewish footballers either being targeted themselves or able to challenge antisemitism, meaning the spotlight was on other forms of racism, particularly toward black footballers and supporters:

> The black lobby had a mouthpiece. This is something much more powerful than we did. They had black players. So every time there was an incident, you would see Cyril Regis or Brendan Batson voice their disapproval. But there was no one to talk on behalf of the Jewish community. We didn't – still don't – have many Jewish players: you could count them on one hand.

At the time of writing, only twelve Jewish footballers have ever played in the English Premier League since its inception in 1992 (Sky Sports 2019).

The JLC's Simon Johnson echoed Berliner in pointing to Kick It Out's early confusion over how to classify and therefore deal with antisemitism as a problem in its own right – because Jews can define themselves by reference to race and/or religion – highlighting how, 'The research into antisemitism will ask the question, "Is it part of racism or isn't it?"'. Johnson pondered how antisemitism has 'morphed into its separate own bespoke area of discrimination, which is odd' and expanded: 'It requires some market focus, but in terms of the nature of the abuse, the impact on victims, the way that it's dealt with by the regulations and discipline, it's exactly the same as any form of racism'.

Berliner [MGB] explained, after years of 'chipping away at it, The FA finally recognised that there was an issue'. However, his sense of accomplishment that antisemitism was finally being publically recognised by The FA as a problem was tempered because: 'Then they inexplicably linked it to Islamophobia. We [invited representatives from the Jewish and Muslim communities] were just looking at each other, thinking "why have they joined the two things together?" And this went on for a while'. Berliner was referring to The FA's inaugural Faith Summit in April 2008. While the summit's aim to eradicate religious abuse in football – particularly aimed at Muslims and Jews – was well-meaning, the merging of Islamophobia with antisemitism points to a failure by The FA to fully understand the respective problems, nor the nuanced ways in which antisemitism within English football is manifest, particularly centring around the common usage (and contested meanings) of the 'taboo' word 'Yid' in fan culture. For as Meer and Noorani (2008) point out, while there are historical-structural similarities in both the larger political context, as well as the internal heterogeneity of Jews and Muslims, and while it can be helpful to share experiences and see what can be learned from an understanding of racism directed at another

minority, there are also different socio-historical dimensions between the Jewish and Muslim communities that need to be recognised.

Awoderu [FA] agreed that the NGB was confused over how antisemitism should be dealt with and acknowledged the influence of John Mann MP, Chair of the APPG Against Antisemitism, as she reflected upon The FA's sense of direction prior to her appointment in 2010:

> I think people in football did not see or feel that antisemitism was a discrimination issue, that discrimination was always about racism until *The Y-Word* [2011] – well no, until 2008 when John Mann's involvement and his report brought the subject matter much more to the forefront.

Since being initially addressed in 2008 by The FA's Faith Summit, then more publically in 2011, antisemitism has occupied a sporadic position on English football's anti-discrimination agenda. Berliner [MGB] observed, 'It tends to go in cycles. It goes up and down because it depends what's sort of flavour of the month', while Rich [CST] noted, 'Events drive the prioritisation and media coverage does'. The events that Rich refers to have tended to be incidents of antisemitism that agencies have reacted to, most often involving supporters, which have centred on the use of 'Yid' within the vernacular culture of fans, especially by Tottenham supporters. This is a problematic dimension of the antisemitism in English football for two reasons: first, there is a preoccupation with the term at the expense of other expressions of antisemitic rhetoric; second, there are polemic stances on Tottenham supporters' adopted use of the word, which confuse – and arguably oversimplify – responses to tackling antisemitism more broadly. As far as attention afforded by campaigns, policies and interventions, Tottenham supporters are apparently rendered the foremost 'problem' and the 'simple solution' is deemed to be stopping them from using 'Yid'/'Yid Army' as a self-referent, with a delusional expectation that this will stop their abusers using antisemitic rhetoric towards them.

Arkush, from the Board of Deputies, and also Mann [APPG] were vehement about the contentious usage of the word by Tottenham supporters (whether Jewish or Gentile), with the latter arguing, 'The Y-word is a key part of the problem. It's not a badge of honour, it's a badge of racism. There needs to be concerted action to stamp it out'. In contrast, Johnson [JLC] was concerned that, 'The Y-word is in danger of being a red herring because – if that's the only thing they think they need to address in order to deal with antisemitism – they won't do it, it won't succeed'. Johnson plainly recognised that antisemitism was a multi-dimensional problem and that there were other formations that needed addressing. He was unequivocal about where the focus of attention should be:

> There is a rather blind obsession with the Y-word. What I want to concentrate on are the Hitler chants, Hitler salutes, the hissing, and the genuine anti-Semites who are using abusive Holocaust denial, Holocaust justification, and songs minimising, diminishing the Holocaust – because in my view, that is the real antisemitism: the people who do not know – or who do know and don't care – that when you make a hissing noise, or sing a song about Belsen, or give a Hitler salute, you are trivialising the Holocaust. You are using the Holocaust in a way that every text book, every guide, every definition of racism tells you is a pure example of racism and antisemitism. That's what we've got to concentrate on.

Johnson's comments expose a lack of agreement between the elite stakeholders and their respective agencies over what the key problem(s) pertaining to antisemitism in English football actually is and where efforts should be concentrated to tackle it.

Other problems of an antisemitic nature in English football, particularly those pertaining to the conduct of club officials and professional players have typically seemed to garner much less attention in terms of campaigns and policies than the behaviour of supporters. However, Johnson [JLC] described how, 'The Anelka case became a bit of a *cause célèbre* within the Jewish community'. Berliner explained how the Jewish community looked to The FA to take decisive action: 'We needed the full

weight of the authorities to say, “We are not going to accept this, we need to stamp this out”’. How Anelka’s quenelle was addressed is considered below.

‘They were clueless’: Up the Policy Stream without a Paddle?

In the MSA’s policy stream, experts within policy communities lobby for and propose ideas and solutions to an identified problem. My interviews indicate that this has proved to be problematic in terms of individuals or organisations proposing solutions to tackle antisemitism because of the previously identified lack of clarity over what the problem(s) of antisemitism is/are within English football and so where the focus should be, how to deal with it, and through which policy solutions, interventions and campaigns. Initially, the main concern was simply getting antisemitism recognised as a problem in itself on the wider anti-racism agenda in football, with the first public engagement with the issue being The FA’s 2008 Faith Summit. However, Johnson [JLC] stressed that this was not the first time that antisemitism was addressed, maintaining that when he worked at The FA, ‘It was on the radar. Antisemitism was one of the lower of the profile issues, but it was definitely developing its own bespoke profile’.

Rich [CST] reflected, ‘There must have been people in The FA who saw it [addressing antisemitism] as something worth doing’ and while noting ‘… they were clueless at that stage’ added, ‘They committed to it’. Notwithstanding the frustrations felt within the Jewish organisations, the 2008 Faith Summit marks a milestone in antisemitism featuring on football’s anti-racist agenda. Also of note from the summit was an emergent policy idea to introduce a ‘strict liability’ rule whereby football clubs with supporters or layers found guilty of discriminatory abuse could face either league point deductions or the possibility of playing a set number of matches ‘behind closed

doors'. However, a watered-down version of this policy would not be implemented by The FA until 2014.

The first substantive set of policy recommendations for addressing antisemitism in professional and grassroots football, albeit alongside other faith-based abuse, came by way of Mann's (2010) report on behalf of The FA's Taskforce on Tackling Antisemitism and Islamophobia. The Taskforce was established after the Faith Summit in September 2008, with members from the Jewish and Muslim communities, the football authorities, Kick It Out, UK Football Policing Unit, Metropolitan Police, and Crown Prosecution Service[6]. Mann [APPG] explained why he was invited to lead the Taskforce: 'The FA were concerned that they were getting issues of antisemitism raised and I don't think they knew what to do about it'. Mann (2010) published a report on behalf of the Taskforce in January 2010, identifying 'best practice' and proposing 17 diverse policies and interventions to tackle antisemitism and Islamophobia within professional and grassroots football aimed at spectators, participants, boardrooms and officialdom. This included: increasing Jewish participation in football; tightening The FA's disciplinary measures and also criminal sanctions for racist behaviour; and requiring clubs to implement 'safety charters' and 'educational toolkits' to protect fans, footballers and local communities. Mann's (2010) third recommendation centred on eliminating the use of 'Yid/Yiddo' by football supporters.

The wide-ranging nature of the recommendations is indicative of the multifaceted problem of antisemitism within English football. Some of them were arguably aspirational, rather workable or achievable, but Rich [CST] underlined their importance:

> Once you've got a report with set of recommendations, you've got a structure you can work to and then it's formalised. What it meant was all the future FA initiatives on combatting racism incorporated the outcome of that Taskforce.

> Sometimes less than we wanted. Sometimes they still produced stuff that barely mentioned Jews and antisemitism, which we would complain about.

Indeed, few of the report's recommendations have been met, or even attempted by The FA, professional clubs, or other organisations, underlying the inaction on tackling antisemitism in English football. Mann [APPG] said that 'lots' of the recommendations could have been better addressed. Mann lamented how, 'The FA hasn't increased the involvement of young Jewish kids in football. That's a problem'. Nor have The FA worked on the recommendation to develop a 'Changing Chants Toolkit' for clubs to help marginalise offensive chants 'like "Yiddo", anti-gypsy jibes, racist rants and homophobic slurs', using the CST and other specialist groups alongside Kick it Out to develop educational materials (Mann 2010). Advocating tighter cyber-surveillance and regulation of football supporters to combat such chants, Mann commented: 'When you're selling tickets electronically, to credit cards, to named people, it's very easy to do. Control that and you can identify any football fan with ease in a modern stadium. There's a reluctance [by clubs, English Premier League, and The FA] to do it'.

Another approach to addressing the songs and chants of supporters can be seen in Kick It Out's 2-minute awareness-raising campaign film *The Y-Word*, launched in April 2011 in conjunction with Maccabi GB, CST, and the Shoresh Foundation (a Jewish charitable trust), who helped fund the project. *The Y-Word* was conceived and written by Jewish brothers, David Baddiel (a well-known comedian, writer and television presenter) and Ivor Baddiel (a television producer). They approached Kick It Out with their film concept after they challenged a fellow Chelsea fan for singing 'Fuck the Yids' followed by 'Fuck the Jews'. Their short-film received a mixed reception in the British and Jewish news media and also social media, with many Tottenham supporters resenting the apparent attempt to censure them for historically appropriating

the word to negate the antisemitic abuse they received, rather than target their abusers (Poulton and Durell 2016).

All of my interviewees acknowledged the personal influence of David and Ivor Baddiel in 'telling a persuasive story to frame a policy problem to grab an audiences' interest' (Cairney 2016) and attracting attention to the issues raised by Kick It Out's *The Y-Word*. While the MSA 'helps to clarify the role of 'timing' and idioms such as 'being in the right place at the right time' in policymaking' (Cairney 2018: 206), in the case of the Baddiel brothers, with their insider access to the cultural establishment and media outlets, a more accurate observation might be 'getting in the right place, with the right people, at the right time'. In securing both access and resources, the Baddiels proved to be highly skilled at 'coupling'. They were able to use their 'well known-ness' as oxygen for publicity and to gain support from the relevant third-sector organisations within the Jewish community, as well as Kick It Out, and to gain funding from them. However, this project and the media and public attention it attracted did not lead to the formulation or implementation of a policy on use the term 'Yid' from The FA – or antisemitism more broadly – in English football at this time.

Aworderu, who was not at The FA at the time, believed *The Y-Word* was 'more of a game-changer than the report that John did – although the two go hand-in-hand – in terms of bringing the subject matter to the forefront. Before, I don't think people really 'got' why this was a problem'. As a means of addressing antisemitism in English football, Rich [CST] recognised the film's effectiveness in initiating debate: 'It was a useful campaigning tool. It certainly raised the issue, brought attention to the issue, got people discussing it and talking about it. So, in that respect, it worked as an intervention to get the issue on people's agenda'. In contrast, Johnson [JLC] contested:

> *The Y-Word* was an awareness-raising exercise, rather than the first targeted intervention. It wasn't a [policy] measure because I don't think it changed

> anybody's behaviour. In my view, it raised awareness. I don't think it solved a problem. It highlighted an issue.

Interestingly in this connection, Kick It Out's CEO, Roisin Wood, revealed that *The Y-Word* film might be revisited because of the criticism it has received from myself (Poulton 2016) and many Tottenham supporters for appearing to target them, rather than their abusers:

> We're looking at the film again, mainly because of a lot of the concerns that you've raised with us to be honest… Most of our reports are about hissing – 'Gas the Jews' – and related to the Holocaust and therefore if we're going to do a film about this again, then I think that's what we need to focus on.

Wood's comments on *The Y-Word* – along with the interviewees' different views on the actual term – point again to a lack of clarity over how to deal with the issue and the disagreement over whether Tottenham supporters should be targeted to desist self-referencing as 'Yids'/'Yid Army'/'Yiddos', as well as the nature of the problem(s) pertaining to antisemitism within English football more broadly.

Curiously, The FA had been publicly quiet on antisemitism since their 2008 Faith Summit and completely silent on the debate over use of 'Yid' that ensued after *The Y-Word's* release. It was therefore surprising that a month into the 2013-14 season, The Football Association (2013) issued an unprecedented public statement warning fans that 'use of the term [Yid] in a public setting could amount to a criminal offence, and leave those fans liable to prosecution and potentially a lengthy Football Banning Order'. The policy statement, endorsing criminal sanctions, said that the word 'is likely to be considered offensive by the reasonable observer' and is 'inappropriate in a football setting' (ibid.). The Prime Minister at the time, David Cameron, became immersed in the ensuing public 'Y-word debate' when he commented to *The Jewish Chronicle*: 'There's a difference between Spurs fans self-describing themselves as Yids and

someone calling someone a Yid as an insult. Hate speech should be prosecuted - but only when it's motivated by hate' (Pollard 2013).

A month later in October 2013, three Tottenham supporters were singled out, arrested and charged with a racially aggravated (*not* motivated) offence under Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986 for repeated use of 'Yid' inside Tottenham's stadium. These arrests caused further consternation amongst Tottenham supporters, with many believing they were again being wrongly targeted, this time by The FA and consequently the criminal justice system (Poulton 2016). The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) discontinued the case against the three Tottenham fans the eve of their criminal trial in March 2014, citing the standard of proof needed for conviction and the *context* in which the word was used (Poulton 2016).

The FA have not publically commented on the CPS's withdrawal of the criminal charges, nor reiterated their positioning since 2013. This is an example of a policy action being initiated, but falling onto the backburner, rather than being a substantial agenda change. Asked whether this was because The FA have rescinded their position, Awoderu confirmed that their support for criminal sanctions in respect of the use of 'Yid' has not changed:

> No, why would you retract that statement? It is better to send a positive message out to those who would be affected and impacted than to be sitting on the fence about it, which we had done for years. It may appear that there is a misalignment, but there is no way we would have made our statement [on use of 'Yid'] without making sure we were aligned with the CPS on this. It was absolutely the right thing for The FA to do in terms of declaring that positioning, rather than having the perception that we don't take antisemitism seriously.

Awoderu argued that the CPS' decision to discontinue the prosecutions was specific to the facts of 'as and when the word was used' in those individual cases and whether there was a 'realistic prospect of conviction'. This leaves open the possibility that there could be future circumstances in which the use of the word in a public setting could still

amount to a criminal offence. From this, it would seem that The FA are unmoved by the controversy and criticism that these arrests and the aborted trial caused.

There was more consensus among my interviewees on how The FA dealt with an expressive form of antisemitism by a professional footballer in 2014. Johnson [JLC] underlined the significance of the case:

> I could see the potential for this to be a test case that would go one way or the other. If The FA refused to bring action against Nicolas Anelka – or took action and found the case against him not proven – I think it would have set back the cause of anti-racism, not just antisemitism, by ten years and we would have to have changed the rules and regulations... As it happened, he was found guilty and so it set a really important precedent, not just for dealing with antisemitism, but for dealing with any act of racism because it establishes strict liability.

The FA fined Anelka £80,000 and issued him with a five-match ban and mandatory education course. Notwithstanding this, Anelka's punishment was the most lenient that The FA could have imposed under their newly revised anti-discrimination rules and comparatively light compared to the respective disciplinary action received by footballers John Terry and Luis Suarez for their respective racist offences (Burdsey 2014). Anelka's club, West Brom, suspended him and later terminated his contract. Summarising the impact of The FA's sanctions against both Anelka and also Wigan Chairman, Dave Whelan, Johnson [JLC] concluded: 'Those were really visible, high-profile steps. If you are serious about stamping out racism then you have to show you've dealt with this. Then everybody – fans included – can see footballers and club chairmen don't get away with it'.

Arkush confirmed the Board of Deputies were satisfied with The FA's policy action in dealing with Anelka: 'We insisted The FA had a proper investigation, which there was, and the Board were consultees to that and gave evidence. I think The FA did deal with that quite effectively and then one or two players [Benoit Assou-Ekotto and Yannick Sagbo] who subsequently expressed support for Anelka'. Rich [CST] and

Mann [APPG] concurred with the symbolic importance of these disciplinary proceedings for the Jewish organisations and community more broadly, with Mann explaining it was, 'The watershed moment. That's when people in the Jewish community thought, "Hang on a minute, The FA is serious"'.

Here Mann recognises and applauds how the effectiveness of The FA over this incident through the implementation of their policy instilled a confidence that had been previously lacking in the competence of the NGB. Ahmed (2006) emphasises that sufficient conditions need to be in place for anti-racism to function; this requires a shift from a rhetorical commitment to change, to one actually committed to the performance of proposed change. The Football Association (2013) statement and their ensuing handling of the Anelka case suggest that The FA – albeit three years after Mann's (2010) Taskforce report – finally moved from rhetoric to decisive action on antisemitism from the perception of the Jewish community.

The question of what more could be done to tackle antisemitism in English football and whether policies should be underpinned by education, advocacy or sanctions elicited a variety of responses from my interviewees, suggesting varying levels of satisfaction or confidence that the problem(s) is/are being effectively addressed and that policy ideas and solutions remain in the 'garbage can' still awaiting adoption. Rich [CST] observed:

> Everyone knows what needs to be done and by who. And it's all being done already, to varying extents, it's just a question of how much more do we need to do, or can we do, and can we be a bit more creative about how to do it? But it's not like there's some golden bullet out there that no one has thought of.

Rich's response is interesting because the interviews affirmed that none of the organisations and agencies, despite their best intentions, actually seemed to know what to do as coherent policy to address the different expressive forms of antisemitism within

English football in the various spheres and levels of the game, none least because of the preoccupation with the use of 'Yid'. Nonetheless, Rich identified the two main problems he believes need to be the focus of continuing efforts: 'We need to try to convert all this anecdotal stuff we hear about into actual reports'. This work, according to Rich, is primarily being undertaken by Jewish organisations – 'Maccabi, us [CST], Kick It Out, all the usual agencies are trying' – rather than The FA who actually have the power and authority to implement policy. For example, CST and Maccabi worked with Kick It Out (2016) to increase awareness of the reporting and support mechanisms available, producing 'Playing the Game: Reporting Antisemitism in Football', a downloadable brochure for Jewish community.

The other problem pertaining to antisemitism that Rich [CST] would like to see continuing efforts on is 'the bigger scale, mass fans singing antisemitic songs in the football ground, on trains, or wherever'. He reflected on the conundrum facing agencies given the effort and resources that this already receives:

> We already have the campaigns telling people not to and you already have people getting arrested for it. What else can be done? I'm not sure what else can be done to prevent those small numbers of fans from singing that stuff in the first place because the obvious things to stop it are already happening.

The FA's Lynch was keen to 'keep it [antisemitism] on the agenda, not wait for incidents to happen'. He believed the best way to do this was through 'more education'. Johnson [JLC] agreed, but advocated punitive measures: 'I think we're in a period where the education work has taken us so far; we need now to just make sure there are high-profile, visible deterrents through the [NGB] disciplinary system'. Mann [APPG] also proposed more stringent punishments – including criminal action – for perpetrators of antisemitism, bemoaning how: 'It seems less of an issue. People get away with it'.

Over the decade since antisemitism was finally recognised as a specific problem requiring bespoke policy solutions, the focus of the most high-profile campaign (Kick It Out's *The Y-Word* film) and also The Football Association's (2013) statement have been on the use of 'Yid' within fan culture, particularly by Tottenham supporters. Indeed, they seem to be a 'convenient problem' for targeted action and perhaps a diversion from other problems of casual antisemitism expressed by opposing clubs' fans, players, club officials and even CEO of The FA. Notwithstanding this, there has been improvement in recent years with the policy agenda substantially advanced with regard to NGB sanctions for players and club officials – seen most noticeably through The FA's decisive action against Anelka.

Politics Stream: 'These things slip down the priority list'

The political stream within the MSA includes factors such as public mood, lobbyist/pressure group campaigns, and ideological distributions or persuasions within government or organisational structure. These factors affect whether the environment is ripe for policy entrepreneurs to turn the spotlight onto their 'problem' and for policymakers to turn a proposed solution into a policy (Cairney and Jones 2016). However, as outlined, there has not really been consensus on what the 'problem' actually is/are and consequently 'solutions' have been reactive to perceived expressions of antisemitism – especially involving football supporters – rather than proactive. My interviews also revealed that to compound matters, the political stream has not always been conducive to adopting an integrated approach to tackling antisemitism in football; perhaps because of the multiple agencies/interested parties (from both football and the Jewish community) involved and also because The FA has not taken a consistent lead as the NGB, with both the jurisdiction and resources.

Reviewing the pieces of work undertaken to date to tackle antisemitism, Mann [APPG] concluded: 'Kick it Out have done things. The FA's done a bit. The FA could do more. The clubs could do a lot more. It needs The FA to take the lead, then I think those clubs would fall into line because they would feel more obliged to do so'. Arkush [BoD] was more critical:

> I don't think the clubs, or The FA, actually have a really thorough, ongoing, genuine commitment. I think the reason you see spikes, separated by a couple of years, is when they're pushed or shamed into action by some really gross manifestation of racism under their nose.

Berliner [MGB] likewise identified the intermittent interest in antisemitism within football and also criticised the failure of The FA, Premier League, and UEFA to demonstrate authority and direction: 'It is reactive rather than proactive. There is a lack of leadership on the topic and when something major goes wrong, everybody collectively starts reacting and there's still no leader'. As the NGB, that leadership should come from The FA as only they have the ultimate authority to implement policy upon English football. Despite the expectations upon them, the likes of Kick It Out, as a campaigning organisation, can only raise awareness of issues; they have no jurisdiction or power.

Noteworthy in terms of the governance of The FA, there have been several Jewish men in positions of power and influence within the NGB, yet none were policy entrepreneurs, nor apparently not championed the problem of antisemitism in English football. In addition to one of my interviewees, Simon Johnson [JLC], who worked at The FA 2005-2010, they included: David Dein (Vice-Chairman, 2000-2004); Lord Triesman (Chairman, 2008 to 2010); David Bernstein (Chairman, 2011-2013). Mann [APPG] commented, 'They could have done more'. My Jewish interviewees were more conciliatory. Rich [CST] noted, 'You do get this phenomenon – not just in football, in

politics as well – high profile Jewish people who don't want to be identified as 'the Jew', who don't want to only speak out on Jewish issues'. Similarly, Berliner [MGB] sympathised: 'A very awkward situation for them as Jews in prominent positions'. Johnson [JLC] was candid about his own involvement: 'From my position as the officer in charge of race equality, if I had spent all my time on antisemitism and ignored other larger minority groups, I'd never have got anywhere with the black and Asian communities'.

This situation infers that even with potentially influential Jewish men within the NGB, the conditions were still not conducive in the political stream to tackle antisemitism in English football. Another factor to consider in this context is the lack of famous Jewish footballers playing in the English professional leagues as either targets for, or challengers to, antisemitism. This in turn would explain a lack of media and political interest. Instead, Rich [CST] highlighted the significant contribution made by John Mann to 'push it as an issue' after the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism in 2006. As Cairney (2018: 203) observes, policymakers 'pay attention to things they care about, or are familiar with'. Being Chair of the APPG Against Antisemitism, this was a cause dear to Mann and, together with his political experience as a parliamentarian, he was able to use his 'knowledge of the process to further their own policy ends' (Kingdon 1984: 21). In this way, Mann can be recognised as a key policy entrepreneur for facilitating antisemitism getting recognised in English football, even though he was unable to couple all three streams.

Another issue pertaining to The FA's governance surfaced in relation to why it took them twenty-two months to officially respond to Mann's (2010) report. Mann commented: 'The FA's structures for dealing with this remain arcane and anti-democratic and that's a fundamental problem'. Johnson [JLC], who worked at The FA

until 2010, conceded: 'By the time I left The FA, it was nowhere. It was sitting in the abyss, it was in a vacuum'. This suggests a lack of underpinning political commitment and receptivity from The FA, which limits policy development. Rich [CST] said of the delay, 'Unless you've always got people from the outside nudging, these things slip down the priority list'. Rich's insight emphasises the influential role of policy entrepreneurs in lobbying for an issue to be addressed. As the MSA framework explains, policy entrepreneurs must use their knowledge, influence and tenacity while awaiting the convergence of all three streams to exploit a window of opportunity. In the meantime, an issue such as antisemitism may get pushed to the backburner as it vies for position on football's main anti-discrimination agenda.

This might explain the delay in the NGB acting upon Mann's (2010: 6) recommendation to 'help clubs phase out racist chants like Yiddo'. Awoderu explained why The FA (2013) issued their positioning on use of 'Yid' after a long interlude, during which they did not enter the public debate:

> We weren't visible. The reason why people perceived us to be quiet was because we were. So we needed to put that marker down to make it clear that – based on our rules and regulations – it was something that we were prepared to take on. It was a way of drawing a line between this sort of unconscious acceptance [of supporters using 'Yid'] to, 'We will deal with it if it is reported'. This was something we just couldn't turn a blind eye to any more. John Mann's report was there and one of his recommendations was very much for The FA to sort this out, so this was all part of that work.

The FA's statement was unforeseen by stakeholders within the Jewish community organisations and also Kick It Out. Surprisingly, none were consulted or pre-warned prior to its release. Both Rich from CST and Wood from Kick It Out seemed bemused as they remembered the abrupt timing and substance of The FA's statement. Wood recalled, 'My first thought was, "How are they going to implement that? How are you going to police that whole stand who are all singing? Are you going to arrest them all?"'

Lynch [FA], who has worked for both agencies, reflected, 'I think now there would be a lot more consultation done with The FA and Kick It Out, and the PFA, the Premier League, the Football League'. These comments by my interviewees were revealing with regard to the role that each organisation played and the relationships between them. Organisational fragmentation had been clearly writ large in the past. In MSA terms, this would have prevented a coupling of the three streams. I sensed that collaboration between the agencies had been somewhat fractured, with The FA in particular being insular and detached. This explains why the political stream has not always been receptive to tackling the problem(s) of antisemitism in English football.

Awoderu [FA] implicitly acknowledged that The FA had perhaps not always led by example: 'The FA is a national governing body and so therefore it needs to provide leadership and direction, which is about much more collectiveness and working through the stakeholders'. She also underlined the responsibility of 'the 92 [professional English] clubs and certainly for the 20 [in the Premier League]'. Advocating that, 'a multi-agency approach that works best', Lynch [FA] observed: 'Where this whole agenda really flourishes is when everyone works together. It sounds a bit cliché, but actually there was a moment when everyone was really working together. The FA can do certain things that Kick It Out can't do and vice versa'. He was referring to 'a round table, behind-closed-doors meeting on the back of the Anelka case with CST, Maccabi, Board of Deputies, to discuss what had happened, but also to get people's thoughts and views'. Lynch said of the meeting: 'People are still talking about that being a good exercise and a good intervention from a stakeholder-relations perspective'.

It was apparent that this meeting had been an anomaly and that there was an appetite for more regular consultation and coordination with the NGB from the other

agencies moving forward to address antisemitism in English football through a more collective and coordinated approach. Having worked previously for Kick It Out – who Wood [KIO] entreated 'try really, really hard' to coordinate and work with other agencies – Lynch found the working environment and practices rather different at The FA: 'I was surprised when I came here, the lack of that really, but that might be a cultural thing. I think The FA would be, "We don't really need to tell you because we're The FA". I think that's known and people here would probably concede that'. Awoderu [FA], acknowledging that The FA have had a poor record on imparting or exchanging information with other agencies, commented, 'But we've got better at communicating and a lot of that is to do with confidence within us and new leadership coming in because there are things that we do communicate and entrust that they will manage sensitively through the channels they need to'.

Defending The FA, she explained that they were not always at liberty to share information – 'whether it's Kick It Out or anybody' – due to legal constraints. Awoderu recognised that The FA's silence and apparent secrecy can be perplexing: 'Sometimes, particularly if it's a racism case, it's really difficult for the wider community to understand why we can't be transparent with Kick It Out and equally Kick It Out feel very frustrated that we can't articulate certain things'. She had particular sympathy for Kick It Out and the assumptions and expectations people have about their size, authority and capacity:

> We understand that they're the ones who are getting the bashing. There is this perception that football doesn't care and even Kick It Out doesn't care. Kick It Out are powerless because people think they're this massive organisation and that they can influence and take everybody to task, but it doesn't work like that. Kick It Out would probably need to be a multinational company in order deal with football's ills.

Kick It Out has seventeen employees and received £645,000 in core funding for the 2017-18 season (Wilson 2019). Berliner [MGB] blamed The FA for their lack of

financial support and lamented that the wealth in professional football is not better distributed: 'Roisin [Wood] certainly struggles with her resources. They're completely underfunded for the work they can do'. These thoughts were echoed by Rich [CST], who praised Kick It Out's CEO: 'I do think Roisin's been very good in terms of pushing it and seeing antisemitism as an important issue'. This is illustrative of how a transformation of organisational infrastructure through change of personnel, who ideologically perhaps is more receptive to a particular policy problem, can influence policy change. It also sheds light on how Kick It Out's funding (and staffing) is stretched and how widening their remit to all forms of discrimination may mean these financial and human resources are being spread too thinly.

While not the sympathy reserved for Kick It Out, there was some empathy with The FA. Wood [KIO] explained how the reforms introduced by The FA in March 2017 after their review of governance to ensure compliance with Sport England's Code for Sports Governance – following a parliamentary motion of no confidence – had placed strain on personnel:

> The Equality Department we used to deal with is not there anymore. They've been moved to parts of other departments or made redundant. We feel very much that we've just had to go and do stuff on our own because you couldn't get anything out of The FA during the review.

Wood emphasised how, 'We're independent of The FA and we're very clear about that. People think we are part of them and that's something we fight strongly against'. Demonstrating this independence from the NGB and preparedness to challenge their main funder, she explained:

> We have worked very hard with The FA to help them see their processes from a victim's point of view. This has involved quite robust exchange of views and we have not always seen eye-to-eye. We have also talked to them about how they publish their reasons especially around high profile cases, so that everyone can realise how they reached their decisions. It feels much more of a collaborative process now, but we have to continue to try and make the reporting

> process as transparent, effective and responsive for those who are brave enough to make a complaint.

These comments suggest that working relations and cooperation with the NGB have improved over recent years, perhaps rendering a more conducive climate for a more collaborative approach to tackling antisemitism in the future.

Conclusion

This article has explained the emergence of campaigns, initiatives and policy statements issued by anti-racist groups, governing bodies and non-government agencies to address antisemitism in English football through a thematic analysis of eight elite stakeholder interviews. Gaining qualitative data through these stakeholder interviews has contributed significantly to the in-depth explanation of the policy processes involved in the attempts to tackle antisemitism presented here. The article demonstrates how MSA continues to be a useful approach for understanding agenda-setting, the importance of 'policy windows', interest group lobbying, and especially the role of policy entrepreneurs in this regard. Previous studies have been keen to use MSA to show dramatic or significant policy formulation, legitimation and implementation. However, this study is theoretically distinctive in the way it demonstrates how MSA can also explain *limited* policy change.

The MSA framework helps to explain the apparent *ad hoc* nature of agency responses to antisemitism in English football, particularly from the NGB as the ultimate authority with jurisdiction and resources for policymaking. Significantly though, this application of MSA has shown that the streams have never been aligned for a policy window to be open wide enough, which explains the lack of dramatic policy development to comprehensively tackle antisemitism within English football. MSA

was originally designed for and is usually applied to public policymaking by a single government or organisation. Yet MSA can also be orientated to analyse agenda-setting and policymaking that addresses an ill-defined problem or multi-dimensional problems and also when there is the complex network of organisations (in this case from both football and the Jewish community) attempting to address the issue. My interviews revealed there were various 'problems' pertaining to the phenomenon of antisemitism that were emergent and prominent at various times within English football and that the stakeholders sometimes had different views on the relative significance of these respective problems. Emphasis has tended to be, as is often the case, on the behaviour of football supporters.

Analysis of the primary data yielded from the interviews with key stakeholders present two main findings. First, the study demonstrates that antisemitism has only had intermittent salience on the wider anti-racism agenda in English football, suggesting a lack of underpinning political commitment and understanding – and especially leadership from The FA – which limits proactive and comprehensive policy change or development. This lack of receptivity and support for action to tackle antisemitism within policy-making networks is reflected in the wider political stream. Apart from John Mann's involvement – and a brief comment by David Cameron – there has been little evidence of governmental (for example, by the Home Office or Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) or parliamentary interest in what is after all a much broader socio-political issue. There has been even less evidence of a groundswell of public awareness, let alone support, for action. A further challenge is that antisemitism is competing for attention in the 'primordial soup' of other forms of discrimination, some of which are more obvious, for example based on colour. Given that the Jewish population is very small in England – and with no high profile Jewish professional

footballers, unlike other minority ethnic groups – antisemitism has often been down the pecking order of issues to be tackled. The challenge in gaining access to the policy agenda is further complicated because antisemitism is less clearly defined and understood, due of its heterogeneous manifestations underpinned by religion, ethnicity, geopolitics, or a combination.

That antisemitism does find a presence on the anti-discrimination agenda can be attributed to the second main finding of this study: the invaluable work of dedicated, persistent policy entrepreneurs. The data highlights how Martin Berliner (from Maccabi GB), alongside Jonathan Metliss (now Chair of Action Against Discrimination), were the early activists trying to 'knock down doors' to persuade The FA and Kick It Out that antisemitism needed addressing in both grassroots and professional football. Those pioneers were followed by John Mann MP and David and Ivor Baddiel, who epitomise the role of policy entrepreneurs. Each can be identified as highly motivated, passionate people, dedicated to tackling antisemitism, who proposed solutions to the problems they saw, mobilising public opinion and institutions like The FA and Kick It Out, to ensure their ideas were prominent. Mann and the Baddiels in particular, due to their political and public prominence, were very adept at 'coupling' and so able to connect developments across the multiple streams. These budding policy entrepreneurs pushed attention toward what they saw as the main problems pertaining to antisemitism in English football and pushed their 'pet solutions', but the politics stream was insufficiently aligned at these moments. This was mainly due to The FA being preoccupied with other forms of discrimination compounded by other regulatory issues, including their own governance and lack of diversity, rather than receptive to comprehensive policy development or implementation. Only The FA has the jurisdiction to lead on this, but it has not so far been forthcoming.

This critical analysis of campaigns, initiatives and policies to tackle antisemitism in English football has highlighted a recurring focus on the word 'Yid' as their misguided starting point. Indeed, Simon Johnson, Chief Executive of the Jewish Leadership Council, who has worked for The FA and English Premier League, argues that there is an 'obsession with the Y-word going on within some parts of the anti-racism in football'. The appropriation of the term by some Tottenham supporters appears to blur and undermine the clarity on what the 'real' problem(s) of antisemitism is. A coherent and comprehensive policy to tackle antisemitism in English football should encompass all expressions of antisemitic rhetoric, rather than make central the prevailing focus on supporters' use of 'Yid', especially by Tottenham supporters. The focus should extend to the playing field and offices of those working in football. In this connection, several of my interviewees, including John Mann [APPG], Funke Awoderu [FA] and Jonathan Arkush [BoD], suggested that professional football clubs had a responsibility to do more to address antisemitism.

Importantly, proposals for tackling antisemitism in football should also be invited from and involve working with supporters' associations, trusts and fan groups. Football supporters do not like being told what to do: persuasion not diktat, might in time lead to cultural shifts, aided by self-policing, not force. Lastly, future solutions to tackle antisemitism reside in much more consistent 'joined up' thinking and collaboration between key agencies and stakeholders. This requires The FA to regularly consult and seek expert advice or recommendations from the specialists at Kick It Out, together with representatives from relevant community groups or organisations, such as the CST, Jewish Leadership Council, Board of Deputies, Maccabi GB, and Holocaust Educational Trust, as well as football supporters.

An example of such collaboration in action is Chelsea FC's 'Say No to Antisemitism' campaign, which launched on Holocaust Memorial Day 2018. Chelsea, working with Kick It Out and CST, have provided a training guide for football stadia stewards to help improve understanding of antisemitic behaviour. This is especially welcome given some of Chelsea's fan-base are notorious for their antisemitic and racial abuse. Chelsea also commissioned a new film, directed by Ivor Baddiel, who made *The Y-Word*. It shows social media posts and supporters singing antisemitic songs interspersed with graphic images from Auschwitz, emphasising the hurtful nature of such rhetoric and the defamation of the memory of the Holocaust. There is much less focus on the word 'Yid', as Kick It Out's Roisin Wood promised during her interview.

This article advances our knowledge and understanding of antisemitism within English football and also fills the current research gap on theoretical explanations of the anti-racist policymaking process through an original application and critique of the multiple streams approach. The study of antisemitism in football is vital for comprehending other forms of racism, faith-based abuse, xenophobia, and hate-crime more broadly. Antisemitism is a global problem. This specific showcase of antisemitism in English football is used to shed light on the wider phenomenon that prevails across European football. In finding appropriate solutions to the problem(s) of antisemitism within English football, the expectation and hope is that these can transfer not just internationally and to other sports, but also to wider aspects of social life to help all victims of discrimination and hate crime and prevent more having to endure such vitriol.

Notes

1. Adopted by 31 states, including the UK, France, Germany, Canada and USA, the IHRA definition is not without controversy. It was disavowed by the (opposition) British Labour Party before its contentious adoption in July 2018, due to disagreement over its wording about Israel and anti-Zionism, as well as debates over freedom of expression and a hierarchy of racisms.
2. The situation is different in Scotland, where the religious and political sectarianism that underpins the Glasgow derby has led to sections of Celtic supporters – a club that reflects the Irish-Catholic minority within the city – flying Palestinian flags when playing Israeli clubs in European competitions as expressions of solidarity with Palestinian liberation struggles and opposition to Zionism and the State of Israel. This a position that many Celtic supporters have embraced based on their own personal or ancestral experiences with 'British oppression' (Conner 2014). Their rivals, Rangers supporters, also express their contrasting geo-political ideology and sometimes fly Israeli flags.
3. In a survey of their season-ticket holders (*n*.11389) by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club (2014) to gauge opinion on the use of 'Yid', seventy-four per cent of non-Jewish respondents and seventy-three per cent of Jewish respondents were *in favour* of being allowed to use the word. At the time of writing (on the eve of 2019/20 English season, Tottenham Hotspur initiated a new 'consultation exercise on the use of the Y-word' with their official supporters' club membership.
4. Within the 'garbage can model', participants 'dump' largely unrelated problems and solutions.
5. Action Against Discrimination is a small registered charity (established 2014) to promote knowledge and mutual understanding between racial groups and to eliminate discrimination on the grounds of race. Most of their work focuses on antisemitism. They oppose the use of 'Yid' by Tottenham supporters.
6. The CPS prosecutes criminal cases that have been investigated by the police in England and Wales. They are independent of the police and government.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers. Special thanks are reserved for my interviewees for their time and candour. Thanks also to Barrie Houlihan and especially Iain Lindsey for their generous discussions and feedback on drafts of this article.

References

Ahmed, S. 2006. The non-performativity of anti-racism. *Meridians*, 7(1): 104-126.

Back, L., Crabbe, T. and Solomos, J. 2001. *The changing face of football: Racism, identity and multiculture in the English game*. Oxford: Berg.

Brentin, D. 2015. Does Bosnian football have an antisemitism problem? Available at: https://balkanist.net/does-bosnian-football-have-an-anti-semitism-problem/

Burdsey, D. 2014. One week in October: Luis Suárez, John Terry and the turn to racial neoliberalism in English men's professional football. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 21(5): 429-447.

Burdsey, D. 2011. *Race, Ethnicity and Football: Persisting Debates and Emergent Issues*. London: Routledge.

Cairney, P. 2018. Three Habits of Successful Policy Entrepreneurs. *Policy and Politics*, 46(2): 199-215.

Cairney, P. and Jones, M.D. 2015. Kingdon's Multiple Streams Approach: What Is the Empirical Impact of this Universal Theory? *The Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1): 37-58.

Cleland, J. and Cashmore, E. 2016. Football fans' views on racism in British football. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 51(1): 27-43

Cleland, J. and Cashmore, E. 2014. 'Fans, racism and British football in the 21st century: The existence of a colour-blind ideology'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40 (4): 638-654.

Collins, M. and Kay, T. 2014. *Sport and Social Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

Community Security Trust (2018) Community Security Trust Antisemitism Incidents Report 2017. Available at: https://cst.org.uk/news/blog/2018/02/01/antisemitic-incidents-report-2017

Conner, N. 2014. Global cultural flows and the routes of identity: the imagined worlds of Celtic FC. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 15(5): 525-546.

Dart, J. 2017. Showing Israel the red card. Activists engaged in pro-Palestinian sport-related campaigns. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 9(3): 521-539.

Dean, S. 2019. Raheem Sterling: Social media boycotts and T-shirts not enough to fight racism - we need points deductions and bans. Telegraph (22 May 2019). Available at: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2019/05/22/raheem-sterling-social-media-boycotts-t-shirts-not-enough-fight/

Dixon, K., Lowes, J. and Gibbons, T. 2014. Show Racism the Red Card: Potential Barriers to the Effective Implementation of the Anti-Racist Message. *Soccer and Society*, 17(1): 140-154.

Doidge, M. 2015. *Football Italia*. London: Bloomsbury.

Garland, J. and Rowe, M. 2014. The hollow victory of anti-racism in English football. In M. Hopkins and J. Treadwell (eds.) *Football Hooliganism, Fan Behaviour and Crime*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 92-105.

Garland, J. and Rowe, M. 2001. *Racism and Anti-Racism in Football*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Győri Szabó, R. 2019. Football and Politics in Twentieth-Century Hungary. *International Journal of the History of Sport*. First Published online: 29 June 2019. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2019.1629583

Hirsh, D. 2018. *Contemporary Left Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. and Green, M. 2006. The changing status of school sport and physical education: explaining policy change. *Sport, Education and Society*, 11(1): 73-92.

Hylton, K. and Long, J. 2016. Confronting 'race' and policy: 'How can you research something you say does not exist?' *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 8(2): 202-208.

Hylton, K. 2010. How a turn to critical race theory can contribute to our understanding of 'race', racism and anti-racism in sport. *International Review for Sociology of Sport*, 45(3): 335-354.

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (2016) 'Working Definition of Antisemitism'. Available at: https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/working-definition-antisemitism

Jones, M.D., Peterson, H.L., Pierce, J.P., Bernal, A., Lamberta Raney, H., and Zaharidis, N. 2016. A river runs through it: A multiple streams meta-review. *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1): 13-36.

Kick It Out. 2018. Kick It Out release film urging fans to report antisemitism (3 December). Available at: https://www.kickitout.org/news/kick-it-out-release-film-urging-fans-to-report-antisemitism

Kingdon, J.W. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Harper Collins.

Kushner T. 2013. Anti-Semitism in Britain: Continuity and the absence of a resurgence? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(3): 434-449.

Lawrence, S. and Davis, C. 2019. Fans for diversity? A Critical Race Theory analysis of BAME supporters' experiences of football fandom. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*. First published 17 July 2019). DOI: https://doi-org.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/10.1080/19406940.2019.1627481

Lilleker, D.G. 2003. Interviewing the political elite: Navigating a potential minefield. *Politics*, 23(3): 207–214).

Lusted, J. 2013. Negative equity? Amateurist responses to race equality initiatives in English grass-roots football. In: Burdsey, D. (ed.) *Race, Ethnicity, and Football: Persisting Debates and Emergent Issues.* New York: Routledge. pp. 211-221.

Magrath, R. and Stott, P. 2019. 'Impossible to implement?' The effectiveness of anti-homophobia policy in English professional football. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 11(1): 19-38.

Mann, J. 2010. Football Association Taskforce on Tackling Antisemitism and Islamophobia. London.

Meer, N. 2013. (ed.) Racialization and Religion (Special Issue). *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 36 (3): 385-515.

Meer, N. and Noorani, T. 2008. A sociological comparison of Antisemitism and anti-Muslim sentiment in Britain, *The Sociological Review*, 56 (2), 195-219.

Millward, P. 2008. Rivalries and racisms: 'Closed' and 'open' Islamophobic dispositions amongst football supporters. *Sociological Research Online* 13(6)5.

Sky Sports. 2019. Sky Sports News investigates antisemitism in football (20 May 2019). Available at: https://www.skysports.com/football/news/11095/11724195/sky-sports-news-investigates-anti-semitism-in-football

Piggin, J. and Hart, L. 2017. Physical activity advocacy in the UK: A multiple streams analysis of a hybrid policy issue. *Leisure Studies* 36(5): 708-720.

Poulton, E. 2016. Towards Understanding: Antisemitism and the Contested Uses and Meanings of 'Yid' in English Football. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(11): 1981-2001.

Poulton, E. and Durell, O. 2016. Uses and meanings of 'Yid' in English football fandom: A case study of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 51(6): 715-734.

The Y-Word, 2011. Film. Directed by Ivor Baddiel. UK: Kick It Out.

The Football Association. 2013. FA Statement: Use of the Y-word in football, 9 September. Available at: http://www.thefa.com/news/governance/equality/2013/sep/football-association-position-on-y-word

Tottenham Hotspur Football Club. 2014. Y-Word Consultation Update, 21 March. Available at: http://www.tottenhamhotspur.com/news/y-word-consultation-update-210314/

Weible, C.M. and Schlager, E. 2016. The Multiple Streams Approach at the Theoretical and Empirical Crossroads. *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1): 5-12.

Wilson, J. 2019. Doubts over future of Kick It Out charity as Premier League launch own 'No Room for Racism' campaign (Telegraph, 29 March 2109). Available at: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2019/03/25/doubts-future-ofkick-charity-premier-league-launch-no-room-racism/

Winter, H. 2018. 'How can players and clubs take the FA seriously after Martin Glenn's crass comments?' *The Times* (March 6 2018). Available at: https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/how-can-players-and-clubs-take-the-fa-seriously-after-martin-glenns-crass-comments-jrhqvqmfn

Woźniak, W. 2018. 'Poland'. In De Waele, J-M., Gibril, S., Gloriozova, E., Spaaij, R. (eds.) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Football and Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 223-244.

Zahariadis, N. 2007. The Multiple Streams Framework: Structure, Limitations, Prospects. In P.A. Sabatier (ed.) *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 65-92.

Diagram 1: The multiple agencies and interested parties potentially involved in addressing antisemitism within English football